


REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on September 27, 2005. In the Office Letter the Examiner has rejected claims 6-18 under the judicially-created doctrine of double-patenting, claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as anticipated by Rautiola, US 5,991,639 (hereinafter Rautiola), claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. as anticipated by Kikinis, US 6,078,566 (hereinafter Kikinis), and claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rautiola in view of McCann et al., US 6,052,725 (hereinafter McCann).

In response the applicant has cancelled claims 1-5 and added new claims 19-26 for examination. As claims 6-18 are rejected only under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the applicant has provided herewith a terminal disclaimer, rendering claims 6-18 patentable. Further, the applicant is confident the new claims are not anticipated by the references cited and applied, and solicits the Examiner's opinion on the merits for the new claims on behalf of the Office in the next action.

As all of the claims standing for examination and added have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Leonid A. Yegoshin

by 
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457